

## **EXHIBIT 1: UNPUBLISHED ORDERS**

FILED

JUL 13 2011

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
BY                      DEPUTY CLERK

SHANNON PEREZ, HAROLD )  
DUTTON, JR. AND GREGORY TAMEZ )

Plaintiffs )

v. )

STATE OF TEXAS; RICK PERRY, )  
in his official capacity as Governor of the )  
State of Texas; DAVID DEWHURST, )  
in his official capacity as Lieutenant )  
Governor of the State of Texas; JOE )  
STRAUS, in his official capacity as Speaker )  
of the Texas House of Representatives; )  
HOPE ANDRADE, in her official )  
capacity as Secretary of State of the )  
State of Texas )

Defendants )

CIVIL ACTION NO.  
SA-11-CA-360-OLG-JES-XR  
[Lead case]

---

MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE )  
CAUCUS, TEXAS HOUSE OF )  
REPRESENTATIVES (MALC) )

Plaintiffs )

v. )

STATE OF TEXAS; RICK PERRY, )  
in his official capacity as Governor of the )  
State of Texas; DAVID DEWHURST, )  
in his official capacity as Lieutenant )  
Governor of the State of Texas; JOE )  
STRAUS, in his official capacity as Speaker )  
of the Texas House of Representatives; )

Defendants )

CIVIL ACTION NO.  
SA-11-CA-361-OLG-JES-XR  
[Consolidated case]

TEXAS LATINO REDISTRICTING  
TASK FORCE, JOEY CARDENAS,  
ALEX JIMENEZ, EMELDA  
MENENDEZ, TOMACITA OLIVARES,  
JOSE OLIVARES, ALEJANDRO ORTIZ,  
AND REBECCA ORTIZ

Plaintiffs

v.

RICK PERRY, in his official capacity  
as Governor of the State of Texas

Defendants


CIVIL ACTION NO.  
SA-11-CA-490-OLG-JES-XR  
[Consolidated case]

**ORDER GRANTING THE TEXAS DEMOCRATIC PARTY  
AND BOYD RICHIE'S MOTION TO INTERVENE**

Pending before the Court is the Motion to Intervene filed by the Texas Democratic Party ("TDP") and Mr. Boyd Richie in Cause No. SA-11-CA-361. (Dkt. #16). The movants' request is timely, and they have met all requirements under Fed.R.Civ.P. 24(a)(2). Plaintiffs do not oppose the intervention (Dkt. #16, p. 6), and Defendants have not filed a response indicating that they oppose the intervention. See Local Rule CV-7(d) ("If there is no response filed within the time period prescribed by this rule, the Court may grant the motion as unopposed").

It is therefore ORDERED that the Motion to Intervene filed by the Texas Democratic Party ("TDP") and Mr. Boyd Richie in Cause No. SA-11-CA-361(Dkt. #16) is GRANTED, and the movants will be entitled to appear as Intervenors in the above styled consolidated action.

SIGNED and ENTERED this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2011.



ORLANDO L. GARCIA  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

*And on behalf of:*

Jerry E. Smith  
United States Circuit Judge  
U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit

*- and -*

Xavier Rodriguez  
United States District Judge  
Western District of Texas

**FILED**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

**JUL 15 2011**

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
BY                      DEPUTY CLERK

SHANNON PEREZ, HAROLD )  
DUTTON, JR. AND GREGORY TAMEZ )

Plaintiffs )

v. )

STATE OF TEXAS; RICK PERRY, )  
in his official capacity as Governor of the )  
State of Texas; DAVID DEWHURST, )  
in his official capacity as Lieutenant )  
Governor of the State of Texas; JOE )  
STRAUS, in his official capacity as Speaker )  
of the Texas House of Representatives; )  
HOPE ANDRADE, in her official )  
capacity as Secretary of State of the )  
State of Texas )

Defendants )

CIVIL ACTION NO.  
SA-11-CA-360-OLG-JES-XR  
[Lead case]

---

MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE )  
CAUCUS, TEXAS HOUSE OF )  
REPRESENTATIVES (MALC) )

Plaintiffs )

v. )

STATE OF TEXAS; RICK PERRY, )  
in his official capacity as Governor of the )  
State of Texas; DAVID DEWHURST, )  
in his official capacity as Lieutenant )  
Governor of the State of Texas; JOE )  
STRAUS, in his official capacity as Speaker )  
of the Texas House of Representatives; )

Defendants )

CIVIL ACTION NO.  
SA-11-CA-361-OLG-JES-XR  
[Consolidated case]

TEXAS LATINO REDISTRICTING  
TASK FORCE, JOEY CARDENAS,  
ALEX JIMENEZ, EMELDA  
MENENDEZ, TOMACITA OLIVARES,  
JOSE OLIVARES, ALEJANDRO ORTIZ,  
AND REBECCA ORTIZ

Plaintiffs

v.

RICK PERRY, in his official capacity  
as Governor of the State of Texas

Defendants


CIVIL ACTION NO.  
SA-11-CA-490-OLG-JES-XR  
[Consolidated case]

# **ORDER GRANTING CONGRESSMAN HENRY CUELLAR'S MOTION TO INTERVENE**

Pending before the Court is the Motion to Intervene filed by Congressman Henry Cuellar in cause number SA-11-CA-361. (Dkt. #24). The movant's request is timely, and he has met all requirements under Fed.R.Civ.P. 24(a)(2). Alternatively, movant has shown that he should be permitted to intervene under Fed.R.Civ.P. 24(b)(1)(B). Plaintiffs do not oppose the intervention (Dkt. #24, p.7), and Defendants have not filed a response indicating that they oppose the intervention. See Local Rule CV-7(d) ("If there is no response filed within the time period prescribed by this rule, the Court may grant the motion as unopposed").

It is therefore ORDERED that the Motion to Intervene filed by Congressman Henry Cuellar (Dkt. # 24) is GRANTED, and Congressman Cuellar is permitted to appear as Plaintiff-Intervenor in the above styled consolidated action.

SIGNED and ENTERED this 14<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2011.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Orlando L. Garcia", written above a horizontal line.

ORLANDO L. GARCIA  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

*And on behalf of:*

Jerry E. Smith  
United States Circuit Judge  
U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit

*- and -*

Xavier Rodriguez  
United States District Judge  
Western District of Texas

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

FILED

JUL 25 2011

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
BY                      DEPUTY CLERK

SHANNON PEREZ, HAROLD  
DUTTON, JR. AND GREGORY TAMEZ

Plaintiffs

v.

STATE OF TEXAS; RICK PERRY,  
in his official capacity as Governor of the  
State of Texas; DAVID DEWHURST,  
in his official capacity as Lieutenant  
Governor of the State of Texas; JOE  
STRAUS, in his official capacity as Speaker  
of the Texas House of Representatives;  
HOPE ANDRADE, in her official  
capacity as Secretary of State of the  
State of Texas

Defendants

CIVIL ACTION NO.  
SA-11-CA-360-OLG-JES-XR  
[Lead case]

MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE  
CAUCUS, TEXAS HOUSE OF  
REPRESENTATIVES (MALC)

Plaintiffs

-and-

THE HONORABLE HENRY CUELLAR,  
Member of Congress, CD 28; THE TEXAS  
DEMOCRATIC PARTY and BOYD  
RICHELIE, in his official capacity as Chair of  
the Texas Democratic Party; and LEAGUE  
OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN  
CITIZENS (LULAC) and its individually  
named members

Plaintiff-Intervenors

v.

STATE OF TEXAS; RICK PERRY,  
in his official capacity as Governor of the

CIVIL ACTION NO.  
SA-11-CA-361-OLG-JES-XR  
[Consolidated case]



State of Texas; DAVID DEWHURST,  
in his official capacity as Lieutenant  
Governor of the State of Texas; JOE  
STRAUS, in his official capacity as Speaker  
of the Texas House of Representatives;

Defendants

TEXAS LATINO REDISTRICTING  
TASK FORCE, JOEY CARDENAS,  
ALEX JIMENEZ, EMELDA  
MENENDEZ, TOMACITA OLIVARES,  
JOSE OLIVARES, ALEJANDRO ORTIZ,  
AND REBECCA ORTIZ

Plaintiffs

v.

RICK PERRY, in his official capacity  
as Governor of the State of Texas

Defendants

CIVIL ACTION NO.  
SA-11-CA-490-OLG-JES-XR  
[Consolidated case]

MARGARITA V. QUESADA; ROMEO  
MUNOZ; MARC VEASEY; JANE  
HAMILTON; LYMAN KING; and  
JOHN JENKINS

Plaintiffs

v.

RICK PERRY, in his official capacity  
as Governor of the State of Texas; and  
HOPE ANDRADE, in her official  
capacity as Secretary of State for the  
State of Texas

Defendants

CIVIL ACTION NO.  
SA-11-CA-592-OLG-JES-XR  
[Consolidated case]

## ORDER

Pending before the Court are various pretrial motions. After reviewing the motions, and any responses thereto, the Court rules as follows:


1. Unopposed Motion for Leave to File Third Amended Complaint, filed by Shannon Perez, Harold Dutton, Jr. Gregory Tamez, Sergio Salinas, Carmen Rodriguez, Rudolfo Ortiz and Nancy Hall (the '360 Plaintiffs) (Dkt. # 52) is GRANTED.
2. Motion to Dismiss [the '360 Plaintiffs'] Second Amended Complaint (Dkt. # 20) is DENIED as moot, in light of the third amended complaint (Dkt. # 53) being filed without objection.
3. Motion to Dismiss MALC's First Amended Complaint (Dkt. # 17) is DENIED as moot, in light of the Second Amended Complaint (Dkt. # 50) being filed without objection.
4. Motion for Leave to file Second Amended Complaint (Dkt. # 59), filed by the Texas Latino Redistricting Task Force, et. al. (the '490 Plaintiffs), is GRANTED as unopposed.
5. Motion to Dismiss [the '490 Plaintiffs] First Amended Complaint (Dkt. # 39) is DENIED as moot, in light of the second amended complaint (Dkt. # 59) being filed without objection.
6. Plaintiffs' Partially Unopposed Motion for Extension of Expert Deadline (Dkt. # 41) is DENIED as moot in light of the amended scheduling order entered on July 19, 2011 (Dkt. # 51).
7. Amended Motion to Intervene filed by the Texas State Conference of NAACP Branches, Howard Jefferson, Juanita Wallace and Rev. Bill Lawson (Dkt. # 64) is GRANTED as unopposed, and these parties shall be allowed to appear as Plaintiff-Intervenors in this consolidated action.
8. Motion to Intervene filed by the Texas State Conference of NAACP Branches, et. al. (Dkt. # 56) is DENIED as moot, because the motion was superseded by amendment (Dkt. # 64).

9. Motions for Admission Pro Hac Vice, filed by Anita Sue Earles (Dkt. # 57) and Allison Jean Riggs (Dkt. # 58) are GRANTED, and movants shall be allowed to appear as counsel on behalf of the NAACP Plaintiff-Intervenors.
10. Texas Legislative Black Caucus Plaintiff-Intervenor's Motion to Intervene (Dkt. # 60) is GRANTED as unopposed, and movants may appear as Plaintiff-Intervenors herein.
11. Motion to Intervene as Plaintiff-Intervenors, filed by Members of the United States Congress (Dkt. # 61) is GRANTED as unopposed, and movants may appear as Plaintiff-Intervenors herein.

The deadline for amendment of pleadings has passed. Any parties that have been given permission to intervene after the deadline for amendment of pleadings should ensure that their pleadings are sufficient.

It is imperative that the parties include a certificate of conference in every motion, or otherwise indicate whether the motion is opposed. If the parties do not indicate that a motion is unopposed, the Court must assume that it is opposed and a ruling will not be forthcoming until the response time has passed. Due to the expedited nature of this matter, the response time may be shortened by order of the Court whenever necessary.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 25 day of July, 2011.



ORLANDO L. GARCIA  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

*And on behalf of:*

Jerry E. Smith  
United States Circuit Judge  
U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit

-and-

Xavier Rodriguez  
United States District Judge  
Western District of Texas

JUN 28 2013

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
BY [Signature] DEPUTY CLERK

## SHANNON PEREZ, et al.

*Plaintiffs*

And

EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, and ALEXANDER

GREEN, MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

And

TEXAS LEGISLATIVE BLACK  
CAUCUS, TEXAS HOUSE OF  
REPRESENTATIVES

And

TEXAS STATE CONFERENCE OF  
NAACP BRANCHES; HOWARD  
JEFFERSON, JUANITA WALLACE and  
REV. BILL LAWSON

*Plaintiffs-Intervenors*

V.

STATE OF TEXAS, et al.

MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE  
CAUCUS, TEXAS HOUSE OF  
REPRESENTATIVES, (MALC)

*Plaintiffs*

And

THE HONORABLE HENRY CUELLAR.

1. **Introduction**  
 2. **Background**  
 3. **Methodology**  
 4. **Results**  
 5. **Discussion**  
 6. **Conclusion**  
 7. **References**  
 8. **Appendix**  
 9. **Figure 1**  
 10. **Figure 2**  
 11. **Figure 3**  
 12. **Figure 4**  
 13. **Figure 5**  
 14. **Figure 6**  
 15. **Figure 7**  
 16. **Figure 8**  
 17. **Figure 9**  
 18. **Figure 10**  
 19. **Figure 11**  
 20. **Figure 12**  
 21. **Figure 13**  
 22. **Figure 14**  
 23. **Figure 15**  
 24. **Figure 16**  
 25. **Figure 17**  
 26. **Figure 18**  
 27. **Figure 19**  
 28. **Figure 20**  
 29. **Figure 21**  
 30. **Figure 22**  
 31. **Figure 23**  
 32. **Figure 24**  
 33. **Figure 25**  
 34. **Figure 26**  
 35. **Figure 27**  
 36. **Figure 28**  
 37. **Figure 29**  
 38. **Figure 30**  
 39. **Figure 31**  
 40. **Figure 32**  
 41. **Figure 33**  
 42. **Figure 34**  
 43. **Figure 35**  
 44. **Figure 36**  
 45. **Figure 37**  
 46. **Figure 38**  
 47. **Figure 39**  
 48. **Figure 40**  
 49. **Figure 41**  
 50. **Figure 42**  
 51. **Figure 43**  
 52. **Figure 44**  
 53. **Figure 45**  
 54. **Figure 46**  
 55. **Figure 47**  
 56. **Figure 48**  
 57. **Figure 49**  
 58. **Figure 50**  
 59. **Figure 51**  
 60. **Figure 52**  
 61. **Figure 53**  
 62. **Figure 54**  
 63. **Figure 55**  
 64. **Figure 56**  
 65. **Figure 57**  
 66. **Figure 58**  
 67. **Figure 59**  
 68. **Figure 60**  
 69. **Figure 61**  
 70. **Figure 62**  
 71. **Figure 63**  
 72. **Figure 64**  
 73. **Figure 65**  
 74. **Figure 66**  
 75. **Figure 67**  
 76. **Figure 68**  
 77. **Figure 69**  
 78. **Figure 70**  
 79. **Figure 71**  
 80. **Figure 72**  
 81. **Figure 73**  
 82. **Figure 74**  
 83. **Figure 75**  
 84. **Figure 76**  
 85. **Figure 77**  
 86. **Figure 78**  
 87. **Figure 79**  
 88. **Figure 80**  
 89. **Figure 81**  
 90. **Figure 82**  
 91. **Figure 83**  
 92. **Figure 84**  
 93. **Figure 85**  
 94. **Figure 86**  
 95. **Figure 87**  
 96. **Figure 88**  
 97. **Figure 89**  
 98. **Figure 90**  
 99. **Figure 91**  
 100. **Figure 92**  
 101. **Figure 93**  
 102. **Figure 94**  
 103. **Figure 95**  
 104. **Figure 96**  
 105. **Figure 97**  
 106. **Figure 98**  
 107. **Figure 99**  
 108. **Figure 100**  
 109. **Figure 101**  
 110. **Figure 102**  
 111. **Figure 103**  
 112. **Figure 104**  
 113. **Figure 105**  
 114. **Figure 106**  
 115. **Figure 107**  
 116. **Figure 108**  
 117. **Figure 109**  
 118. **Figure 110**  
 119. **Figure 111**  
 120. **Figure 112**  
 121. **Figure 113**  
 122. **Figure 114**  
 123. **Figure 115**  
 124. **Figure 116**  
 125. **Figure 117**  
 126. **Figure 118**  
 127. **Figure 119**  
 128. **Figure 120**  
 129. **Figure 121**  
 130. **Figure 122**  
 131. **Figure 123**  
 132. **Figure 124**  
 133. **Figure 125**  
 134. **Figure 126**  
 135. **Figure 127**  
 136. **Figure 128**  
 137. **Figure 129**  
 138. **Figure 130**  
 139. **Figure 131**  
 140. **Figure 132**  
 141. **Figure 133**  
 142. **Figure 134**  
 143. **Figure 135**  
 144. **Figure 136**  
 145. **Figure 137**  
 146. **Figure 138**  
 147. **Figure 139**  
 148. **Figure 140**  
 149. **Figure 141**  
 150. **Figure 142**  
 151. **Figure 143**  
 152. **Figure 144**  
 153. **Figure 145**  
 154. **Figure 146**  
 155. **Figure 147**  
 156. **Figure 148**  
 157. **Figure 149**  
 158. **Figure 150**  
 159. **Figure 151**  
 160. **Figure 152**  
 161. **Figure 153**  
 162. **Figure 154**  
 163. **Figure 155**  
 164. **Figure 156**  
 165. **Figure 157**  
 166. **Figure 158**  
 167. **Figure 159**  
 168. **Figure 160**  
 169. **Figure 161**  
 170. **Figure 162**  
 171. **Figure 163**  
 172. **Figure 164**  
 173. **Figure 165**  
 174. **Figure 166**  
 175. **Figure 167**  
 176. **Figure 168**  
 177. **Figure 169**  
 178. **Figure 170**  
 179. **Figure 171**  
 180. **Figure 172**  
 181. **Figure 173**  
 182. **Figure 174**  
 183. **Figure 175**  
 184. **Figure 176**  
 185. **Figure 177**  
 186. **Figure 178**  
 187. **Figure 179**  
 188. **Figure 180**  
 189. **Figure 181**  
 190. **Figure 182**  
 191. **Figure 183**  
 192. **Figure 184**  
 193. **Figure 185**  
 194. **Figure 186**  
 195. **Figure 187**  
 196. **Figure 188**  
 197. **Figure 189**  
 198. **Figure 190**  
 199. **Figure 191**  
 200. **Figure 192**  
 201. **Figure 193**  
 202. **Figure 194**  
 203. **Figure 195**  
 204. **Figure 196**  
 205. **Figure 197**  
 206. **Figure 198**  
 207. **Figure 199**  
 208. **Figure 200**  
 209. **Figure 201**  
 210. **Figure 202**  
 211. **Figure 203**  
 212. **Figure 204**  
 213. **Figure 205**  
 214. **Figure 206**  
 215. **Figure 207**  
 216. **Figure 208**  
 217. **Figure 209**

CIVIL ACTION NO.  
5:11-CV-0360-OLG-JES-XR  
[Lead Case]

CIVIL ACTION NO.  
5:11-CV-00361-OLG-JES-XR  
[Consolidated Case]

Member of Congress, CD28; THE TEXAS §  
DEMOCRATIC PARTY and BOYD §  
RICHIE, in his official capacity as Chair of §  
the Texas Democratic Party; and LEAGUE §  
OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN §  
CITIZENS (LULAC) and its individually §  
named members §

Plaintiff-Intervenors §

V.

STATE OF TEXAS, *et al.*,

### *Defendants*

TEXAS LATINO REDISTRICTING  
TASK FORCE, *et al.*,

Plaintiff

V.

RICK PERRY, In His Official Capacity  
as Governor of the State of Texas,

Defendant

MARGARITA V. QUESADA; ROMEO MUNOZ; MARC VEASEY; JANE HAMILTON; LYMAN KING; and JOHN JENKINS

Plaintiffs

V.

RICK PERRY, in his official capacity as Governor of the State of Texas, and HOPE ANDRADE, in her official capacity as Secretary of State of the State of Texas

### *Defendants*

---

JOHN T. MORRIS

1. *What is the purpose of this document?*  
 2. *What are the main findings of the study?*  
 3. *What are the implications of these findings?*  
 4. *What are the limitations of the study?*  
 5. *What are the conclusions of the study?*  
 6. *What are the recommendations for future research?*  
 7. *What are the acknowledgments?*  
 8. *What are the references?*  
 9. *What are the appendices?*  
 10. *What are the footnotes?*  
 11. *What are the tables?*  
 12. *What are the figures?*  
 13. *What are the captions?*  
 14. *What are the legends?*  
 15. *What are the abbreviations?*  
 16. *What are the acronyms?*  
 17. *What are the symbols?*  
 18. *What are the units?*  
 19. *What are the dates?*  
 20. *What are the times?*  
 21. *What are the locations?*  
 22. *What are the names?*  
 23. *What are the titles?*  
 24. *What are the subtitles?*  
 25. *What are the subtitles?*  
 26. *What are the subtitles?*  
 27. *What are the subtitles?*  
 28. *What are the subtitles?*  
 29. *What are the subtitles?*  
 30. *What are the subtitles?*  
 31. *What are the subtitles?*  
 32. *What are the subtitles?*  
 33. *What are the subtitles?*  
 34. *What are the subtitles?*  
 35. *What are the subtitles?*  
 36. *What are the subtitles?*  
 37. *What are the subtitles?*  
 38. *What are the subtitles?*  
 39. *What are the subtitles?*  
 40. *What are the subtitles?*  
 41. *What are the subtitles?*  
 42. *What are the subtitles?*  
 43. *What are the subtitles?*  
 44. *What are the subtitles?*  
 45. *What are the subtitles?*  
 46. *What are the subtitles?*  
 47. *What are the subtitles?*  
 48. *What are the subtitles?*  
 49. *What are the subtitles?*  
 50. *What are the subtitles?*  
 51. *What are the subtitles?*  
 52. *What are the subtitles?*  
 53. *What are the subtitles?*  
 54. *What are the subtitles?*  
 55. *What are the subtitles?*  
 56. *What are the subtitles?*  
 57. *What are the subtitles?*  
 58. *What are the subtitles?*  
 59. *What are the subtitles?*  
 60. *What are the subtitles?*  
 61. *What are the subtitles?*  
 62. *What are the subtitles?*  
 63. *What are the subtitles?*  
 64. *What are the subtitles?*  
 65. *What are the subtitles?*  
 66. *What are the subtitles?*  
 67. *What are the subtitles?*  
 68. *What are the subtitles?*  
 69. *What are the subtitles?*  
 70. *What are the subtitles?*  
 71. *What are the subtitles?*  
 72. *What are the subtitles?*  
 73. *What are the subtitles?*  
 74. *What are the subtitles?*  
 75. *What are the subtitles?*  
 76. *What are the subtitles?*  
 77. *What are the subtitles?*  
 78. *What are the subtitles?*  
 79. *What are the subtitles?*  
 80. *What are the subtitles?*  
 81. *What are the subtitles?*  
 82. *What are the subtitles?*  
 83. *What are the subtitles?*  
 84. *What are the subtitles?*  
 85. *What are the subtitles?*  
 86. *What are the subtitles?*  
 87. *What are the subtitles?*  
 88. *What are the subtitles?*  
 89. *What are the subtitles?*  
 90. *What are the subtitles?*  
 91. *What are the subtitles?*  
 92. *What are the subtitles?*  
 93. *What are the subtitles?*  
 94. *What are the subtitles?*  
 95. *What are the subtitles?*  
 96. *What are the subtitles?*  
 97. *What are the subtitles?*  
 98. *What are the subtitles?*  
 99. *What are the subtitles?*  
 100. *What are the subtitles?*

CIVIL ACTION NO.

5:11-CV-0490-OLG-JES-XR

[Consolidated Case]

CIVIL ACTION NO.

SA-11-CA-592-OLG-JES-XR

[Consolidated case]

<i>Plaintiff</i>	§	
	§	CIVIL ACTION NO.
v.	§	SA-11-CA-615-OLG-JES-XR
	§	[Consolidated Case]
STATE OF TEXAS, et al.	§	
<i>Defendants</i>	§	
	§	
EDDIE RODRIGUEZ, MILTON GERARD	§	
WASHINGTON, BRUCE ELFANT, ALEX	§	
SERNA, SANDRA SERNA, BETTY F.	§	
LOPEZ, DAVID GONZALEZ, BEATRICE	§	
SALOMA, LIONOR SOROLA-	§	
POHLMAN; ELIZA ALVARADO;	§	CIVIL ACTION NO.
JUANITA VALDEZ-COX; JOSEY	§	SA-11-CA-635-OLG-JES-XR
MARTINEZ; NINA JO BAKER; TRAVIS	§	[Consolidated case]
COUNTY and CITY OF AUSTIN,	§	
<i>Plaintiffs</i>	§	
	§	
v.	§	
	§	
STATE OF TEXAS, et al	§	
<i>Defendants</i>	§	

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is the Motion to Intervene filed by Congressman Pete Gallego and Congressman Filemon Vela, Jr. in the above-entitled and numbered cause. The movants' request is timely, and they have met all requirements under Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2). Alternatively, movants have shown that they should be permitted to intervene under Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1)(B). Plaintiffs do not oppose the intervention and it serves the ends of justice.

It is therefore ORDERED that the Motion to Intervene filed by Congressman Pete Gallego and Congressman Filemon Vela, Jr. is GRANTED and Congressmen Pete Gallego and Filemon Vela, Jr. are permitted to appear as Plaintiffs-Intervenors in the above-styled consolidated action.


---

JUDGE PRESIDING

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 12-203-CKK-BMK-JDB

**ORDER**

(March 20, 2012)

Before the Court is the [7] Motion to Intervene as Defendants by James Dubose, Junior Glover, Family Unit, Inc., Brenda C. Williams, and Amanda Wolf (collectively “Putative Intervenor”). The Putative Intervenor seek leave to intervene in this action either as of right, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2), or permissively, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1). Defendants oppose intervention as of right, but do not oppose permissive intervention. Atty Gen.’s Resp. to Mot. to Intervene, ECF No. [9]. Plaintiff did not file a response to the Motion to Intervene. Upon consideration of the parties’ submissions, the relevant authorities, and the record as a whole, it is, this 20th day of March, 2012, hereby

**ORDERED** that Putative Intervenor’s [7] Motion to Intervene as Defendants is GRANTED pursuant to Rule 24(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; it is further


**ORDERED** that the Defendant-Intervenor shall confer with Defendants prior to the filing of any motion, responsive filing, brief, or discovery request to determine whether Defendant-Intervenor’s positions can be set forth in a consolidated fashion so that duplication of


effort and redundant filings are avoided. Separate filings by Defendant-Intervenors shall include certificates of compliance with this requirement and a brief description of the need for separate filings; and it is further

**ORDERED** that Defendant-Intervenors shall file their Answer(s) to the [1] Complaint for Declaratory Judgment by no later than **April 9, 2012**.

**SO ORDERED.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**BRETT M. KAVANAUGH**  
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**JOHN D. BATES**  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**COLLEEN KOLLAR-KOTELLY**  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

STATE OF TEXAS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 12-128
	)	(DST, RMC, RLW)
ERIC H. HOLDER, JR.,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**ORDER re EXPEDITED DISCOVERY**

This Court held a teleconference with the State of Texas, the Department of Justice, and two Proposed Intervenors on March 14, 2012 at which the United States proposed multiple months for discovery as to whether the adoption of Senate Bill 14 (“Voter-ID Law”) by the State of Texas resulted from a discriminatory purpose or effect. Having ordered that such a schedule must be expedited, the Court enters the following Order.

Because whether purpose is at issue in this case will likely determine whether a trial is necessary, it is **ORDERED** that the parties shall begin immediately and conclude, no later than **April 16, 2012**, all discovery on whether a discriminatory purpose animated the adoption of the Voter-ID Law. In order to meet this deadline, all parties must respond to discovery requests in an expedited manner; and it is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the State of Texas shall file a motion for protective order regarding alleged privilege(s) of the Texas Legislature no later than **March 22, 2012**;

Defendants shall file oppositions no later than **March 29, 2012**; and the State of Texas shall file its reply, if any, no later than **April 2, 2012**; and it is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the parties shall meet and confer and attempt to establish a joint scheduling order in this case setting forth all discovery deadlines, anticipated trial date, and the estimated number of days for trial, should one be necessary; and it is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the State of Texas shall, no later than **March 29, 2012**, file an affidavit identifying the latest date on which the Voter-ID Law must become effective if it is to apply to elections in November 2012 and providing a detailed explanation therefor; and it is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the United States shall inform the Court and the State of Texas, no later than **April 20, 2012**, whether it will take the position that in addition to having a discriminatory effect, the Voter-ID Law as adopted with a discriminatory purpose; and it is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaint [Dkt. # 16] is **GRANTED**; and it is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that Eric Kennie, Anna Burns, Michael Montez, Penny Pope, Marc Veasy, Jane Hamilton, David De La Fuente, Lorraine Birabil, Daniel Clayton, and Sergio Deleon's Motion to Intervene [Dkt. # 5] is **GRANTED**, and they are permitted to intervene pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b); and it is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the Texas State Conference of NAACP Branches and the Mexican American Legislative Causus's Motion to Intervene [Dkt. # 15] is **GRANTED**; and they are permitted to intervene pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b); and it is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that a telephone conference is scheduled for **March 21, 2012** at 4:30 p.m. The United States shall set up the telephone conference and email the call-in number and passcode to each party and the Courtroom Deputy.

**SO ORDERED.**

Date: March 15, 2012

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
DAVID S. TATEL  
United States Circuit Judge

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
ROSEMARY M. COLLYER  
United States District Judge

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
ROBERT L. WILKINS  
United States District Judge

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and  
ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., in his official  
capacity as Attorney General of the United  
States,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 11-01428  
(CKK) (MG) (ESH)

**ORDER**

(October 19, 2011)

Before the Court are the following motions:

- the [10/13] Amended Motion for Leave to Intervene as Defendants by Kenneth Sullivan, Albert Leo Sullivan, Michael Berman, Senator Arthenia Joyner, Representative Janet Cruz, Helen Gordon Davis, Joyce Hamilton Henry, Harold Weeks, Ophelia Allen, Project Vote, Voting for America, Harry L. Sawyer, Jr., Ion Sancho, Reverend Tom Scott, and the Florida AFL-CIO (collectively, the “Sullivan Group”);
- the [15] Motion to Intervene as Defendants by the Florida State Conference of the NAACP, Belinthia Berry, Sharon Carter, Ella Kate Coffee, Howard Harris, Dianne Hart, Yvette Lewis, Marvin Martin, Charles McKenzie, Jr., Earl Rutledge, Alonda Vaughan, and Paulette Walker (collectively, the “NAACP Group”); and
- the [16] Motion to Intervene as Defendants by the National Council of La Raza and the League of Women Voters of Florida (the “NCLR Group”).

In each instance, the movants seek leave to intervene in this action either as of right, *see* FED. R. CIV. P. 24(a)(2), or permissively, *see* FED. R. CIV. P. 24(b)(1). Plaintiff and Defendants oppose intervention as of right, but do not oppose permissive intervention. Upon consideration of the parties' submissions, the relevant authorities, and the record as whole, it is, this 19th day of October, 2011, hereby

**ORDERED** that the Sullivan Group's [10/13] Amended Motion for Leave to Intervene as Defendants, the NAACP Group's [15] Motion to Intervene as Defendants, and the NCLR Group's [16] Motion to Intervene as Defendants are **GRANTED** pursuant to Rule 24(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; it is further

**ORDERED** that the Sullivan Group, the NAACP Group, and the NCLR Group (collectively, "Defendant-Intervenors") shall confer with each other and Defendants prior to the filing of any motion, responsive filing, brief, or discovery request to determine whether Defendant-Intervenors' positions can be set forth in a consolidated fashion so that duplication of effort and redundant filings are avoided. Separate filings by Defendant-Intervenors shall include certificates of compliance with this requirement and briefly describe the need for separate filings; and it is further

/

/

/

/

/

/

**ORDERED** that Defendant-Intervenors shall file their Answer(s) to the [39] First Amended Complaint for Declaratory Judgment by no later than **Friday, October 28, 2011**.

**SO ORDERED.**

/s/

**MERRICK B. GARLAND**  
United States Circuit Judge

/s/

**ELLEN S. HUVELLE**  
United States District Judge

/s/

**COLLEEN KOLLAR-KOTELLY**  
United States District Judge

Case 1:11-cv-01303-RMC-TBG-BAH Document 11 Filed 08/16/11 Page 1 of 2

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

---

**STATE OF TEXAS,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and  
ERIC H. HOLDER, in his official  
capacity as Attorney General of the  
United States**

**Defendants.**

---

**Civil Action No. 11-1303 (RMC-TBG-  
BAH)**

**ORDER**

Before the Court is the Motion to Intervene as Defendants filed by Wendy Davis, Marc Veasey, John Jenkins, Vicki Bargas and Romeo Munoz ("Movants"). Movants seek to intervene either as of right, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2), or permissively, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1). The parties oppose intervention as of right, but agree that permissive intervention may be proper in this matter. Accordingly, upon consideration of the motion, the parties' memoranda, and the entire record herein, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that the Motion to Intervene as Defendants pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b)(1) [Dkt # 5] is **GRANTED**; it is further

**ORDERED** that defendant-intervenors Wendy Davis, Marc Veasey, John Jenkins, Vicki Bargas and Romeo Munoz shall file their Answer to the Complaint no later than August 24, 2011.

Case 1:11-cv-01303-RMC-TBG-BAH Document 11 Filed 08/16/11 Page 2 of 2

**SO ORDERED**

Date: August 16, 2011

/s/

THOMAS B. GRIFFITH  
United States Circuit Judge

/s/

ROSEMARY M. COLLYER  
United States District Judge

/s/

BERYL A. HOWELL  
United States District Judge



**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

	)	
STATE OF TEXAS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 11-1303 (RMC-TBG-
	)	BAH)
	)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and	)	
ERIC H. HOLDER, in his official	)	
capacity as Attorney General of the	)	
United States	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

## ORDER

Before the Court are Motions to Intervene as Defendants filed by the Mexican American Legislative Caucus of the Texas House of Representatives [Dkt. # 13]; Greg Gonzales, Lisa Aguilar, Daniel Lucio, Victor Garza, Blanca Garcia, Josephine Martinez, Katrina Torres, and Nina Jo Baker, a group of Hispanic and African-American voters residing in Texas [Dkt. #14]; the Texas Legislative Black Caucus [Dkt. # 16]; the Texas Latino Redistricting Task Force [Dkt. # 17]; and the Texas State Conference of NAACP Branches, Juanita Wallace, Rev. Bill Lawson, Howard Jefferson, Ericka Cain, Nelson Linder, and Reginald Lillie [Dkt. # 28], (collectively “Movants”). Movants seek to intervene either as of right, *see* FED. R. CIV. P. 24(a)(2), or permissively, *see* FED. R. CIV. P. 24(b)(1). The Plaintiff opposes intervention on either grounds. The Defendants oppose intervention as of right, but do not oppose permissive intervention by the Movants. Upon consideration of the motions, the parties’ memoranda, and the entire record herein, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that the Motions to Intervene as Defendants pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b)(1) [Dkt. ## 13, 14, 16, 17, 28] are **GRANTED**; it is further

**ORDERED** that all defendant-intervenors shall file Answers to the Complaint no later than September 15, 2011.

**SO ORDERED.**

Date: September 8, 2011

/s/  
THOMAS B. GRIFFITH  
United States Circuit Judge

/s/  
ROSEMARY M. COLLYER  
United States District Judge

/s/  
BERYL A. HOWELL  
United States District Judge

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**STEPHEN LAROQUE, et al.**

**Plaintiffs,**

**v.**

**ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., in his official  
capacity as Attorney General of the United  
States,**

**Defendant.**

**Civil Action No. 10-0561 (JDB)**

**ORDER**

Before the Court is a motion to intervene by Joseph M. Tyson, W.J. Best, Sr., A. Offord Carmichael, Jr., George Graham, Julian Pridgen, William A. Cooke, and the North Carolina Conference of Branches of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Movants seek either intervention as of right, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a), or permissive intervention, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1). Plaintiffs oppose intervention, and defendants do not oppose permissive intervention. Upon consideration of the motion, the parties' several memoranda, and the entire record herein, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that [13] Joseph M. Tyson, et al.'s motion to intervene as defendant is **GRANTED** pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b)(1); it is further

**ORDERED** that Joseph M. Tyson, et al.'s proposed motion to dismiss shall be deemed filed as of this date; and it is further

**ORDERED** that, by not later than September 3, 2010, plaintiff, defendant, and

defendant-intervenors shall confer and jointly submit a proposed briefing schedule to govern further proceedings in this case. To the extent the parties disagree on a proposed briefing schedule, they should so indicate. Along with this joint proposed briefing schedule, defendants and defendant-intervenors shall submit a report discussing what steps they will take to avoid duplication of effort and to reduce redundant filings.

**SO ORDERED.**

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN D. BATES  
United States District Judge

Dated: August 25, 2010

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SHELBY COUNTY, ALABAMA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., in his official  
capacity as Attorney General of the United  
States,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 10-0651 (JDB)

**ORDER**

Before the Court are motions to intervene by Earl Cunningham, et al., Bobby Pierson, et al., and Bobby Lee Harris. Movants seek either intervention as of right, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a), or permissive intervention, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1). The parties do not oppose permissive intervention. Accordingly, upon consideration of the motions, the parties' several memoranda, and the entire record herein, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that [6] Earl Cunningham, et al.'s motion to intervene as defendant is **GRANTED** pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b)(1); it is further

**ORDERED** that [26] Earl Cunningham, et al.'s proposed answer shall be deemed filed as of this date; it is further

**ORDERED** that [9] Bobby Pierson, et al.'s motion to intervene as defendant is **GRANTED** pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b)(1); it is further

**ORDERED** that [15] Bobby Pierson, et al.'s proposed answer shall be deemed filed as of

this date; it is further

**ORDERED** that [18] Bobby Lee Harris's motion to intervene as defendant is  
**GRANTED** pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b)(1); it is further

**ORDERED** that Bobby Lee Harris's proposed answer shall be deemed filed as of this  
date; and it is further

**ORDERED** that, by not later than September 3, 2010, plaintiff, defendant, and  
defendant-intervenors shall confer and jointly submit a proposed briefing schedule to govern  
further proceedings in this case. To the extent the parties disagree on a proposed briefing  
schedule, they should so indicate. Along with this joint proposed briefing schedule, defendants  
and defendant-intervenors shall submit a report discussing the steps they will take to avoid  
duplication of effort and to reduce redundant filings.

**SO ORDERED.**

/s/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN D. BATES  
United States District Judge

Dated: August 25, 2010

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

---

STATE OF GEORGIA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, in his official  
capacity as Attorney General of the  
United States,

Defendant.

---

Civil Action No. 10-1062 (ESH)

**ORDER**

Before the Court is the Motion to Intervene as Defendants filed by Tyrone Brooks, Edward O. DuBose, Helen Butler, Georgia Association of Black Elected Officials, Georgia State Conference NAACP, and Georgia Coalition for the Peoples' Agenda ("Movants"). Movants seek to intervene either as of right, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(1), or permissively, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1)(A) and (B). The parties do not oppose permissive intervention. Accordingly, upon consideration of the motion and the lack of opposition to permissive intervention, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that the motion to intervene as defendants pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b)(1)(A) and (B) [dkt. #5] is **GRANTED**; it is further

**ORDERED** that defendant-intervenors Tyrone Brooks, Edward O. DuBose, Helen Butler, Georgia Association of Black Elected Officials, Georgia State Conference NAACP, and Georgia Coalition for the Peoples' Agenda shall file their Answer; and it is further

**ORDERED** that defendant-intervenors' Answer shall be deemed filed as of the date of this Order.

/s/  
THOMAS B. GRIFFITH  
United States Circuit Judge

/s/  
HENRY H. KENNEDY  
United States District Judge

/s/  
ELLEN SEGAL HUVELLE  
United States District Judge

DATE: July 7, 2010



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

STATE OF GEORGIA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 10-1062 (ESH)
	)	
ERIC H. HOLDER, in his official	)	
capacity as Attorney General of the	)	
United States,	)	
	)	
Defendant,	)	
	)	
TYRONE BROOKS, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendant-Intervenors.	)	

**ORDER**

Before the Court is a motion to intervene as defendant filed by the Georgia Association of Latino Elected Officials (“GALEO”). (Amended Mot. to Intervene, July 16, 2010 [dkt. #21].) GALEO seeks to intervene either as of right, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(1), or permissively, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1)(A) and (B). The parties do not oppose permissive intervention. Accordingly, upon consideration of the motion and the lack of opposition to permissive intervention, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that GALEO’s motion to intervene as defendant pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b)(1)(A) and (B) [dkt. #21] is **GRANTED**; it is further

**ORDERED** that defendant-intervenor GALEO shall file its Answer; it is further

**ORDERED** that defendant-intervenor GALEO's Answer shall be deemed filed as of the date of this Order; and it is further

**ORDERED** that defendant-intervenor GALEO shall comply with all deadlines in the July 12, 2010 Scheduling Order.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
THOMAS B. GRIFFITH  
United States Circuit Judge

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
HENRY H. KENNEDY  
United States District Judge

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
ELLEN SEGAL HUVELLE  
United States District Judge

DATE: July 28, 2010

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**STATE OF GEORGIA,**

**Plaintiff,**

**V.**

**Civil Action No. 10-1062 (ESH)**

**ERIC H. HOLDER, in his official  
capacity as Attorney General of the  
United States,**

**Defendant,**

**TYRONE BROOKS, et al.,**

**Defendant-Intervenors,**

**GEORGIA ASSOCIATION OF  
LATINO ELECTED OFFICIALS,**

**Defendant-Intervenor.**

## ORDER

Before the Court is a motion to intervene as defendants filed by Marvin Lim, the Organization of Chinese Americans Georgia Chapter, and the Asian American Legal Advocacy Center of Georgia (collectively “Movants”). (Mot. to Intervene, July 26, 2010 [dkt. #22].) Movants seek to intervene either as of right, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(1), or permissively, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1)(A) and (B). The parties do not oppose permissive intervention. (*See id.*, Ex. C, Decl. of Glenn D. Magpantay, ¶¶ 10, 11, 12; Attorney General’s Response to Mot. to Intervene, July 28, 2010 [dkt. #23].) Accordingly, upon consideration of the motion and the lack of opposition to permissive intervention, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that the motion to intervene as defendants filed by Marvin Lim, the Organization of Chinese Americans Georgia Chapter, and the Asian American Legal Advocacy Center of Georgia pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b)(1)(A) and (B) [dkt. #22] is **GRANTED**; it is further

**ORDERED** that Movants shall file their Answer; it is further

**ORDERED** that Movants' Answer shall be deemed filed as of the date of this Order; and it is further

**ORDERED** that Movants shall comply with all deadlines in the July 12, 2010 Scheduling Order.

/s/  
THOMAS B. GRIFFITH  
United States Circuit Judge

/s/  
HENRY H. KENNEDY  
United States District Judge

/s/  
ELLEN SEGAL HUVELLE  
United States District Judge

DATE: July 29, 2010

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**STATE OF GEORGIA,**

**Plaintiff,**

**V.**

**Civil Action No. 10-1062 (ESH)**

**ERIC H. HOLDER, in his official  
capacity as Attorney General of the  
United States,**

**Defendant,**

**TYRONE BROOKS, et al.,**

## Defendant-Intervenors,

**GEORGIA ASSOCIATION OF  
LATINO ELECTED OFFICIALS,**

**Defendant-Intervenor,**

MARVIN LIM, et al.,

### Defendant-Intervenors.

## ORDER

Before the Court is a motion to intervene as defendants filed by Concerned Black Clergy of Metropolitan Atlanta, the Southern Regional Office of the Rainbow Push Coalition, Michael B. Wright, Sr., and Janice Mathis (collectively “Movants”). (Mot. to Intervene, Aug. 2, 2010 [dkt. #28].) Movants seek to intervene either as of right, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(1), or permissively, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1)(A) and (B). The parties do not oppose permissive intervention. (Mot. ¶ 22.) Accordingly, upon consideration of the motion and the lack of opposition to permissive intervention, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that the motion to intervene as defendants filed by Concerned Black Clergy of Metropolitan Atlanta, the Southern Regional Office of the Rainbow Push Coalition, Michael B. Wright, Sr., and Janice Mathis pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b)(1)(A) and (B) [dkt. #28] is **GRANTED**; it is further

**ORDERED** that Movants shall file their Answer; it is further

**ORDERED** that Movants' Answer shall be deemed filed as of the date of this Order; and it is further

**ORDERED** that Movants shall comply with all deadlines in the July 12, 2010 Scheduling Order.

/s/  
THOMAS B. GRIFFITH  
United States Circuit Judge

/s/  
HENRY H. KENNEDY  
United States District Judge

/s/  
ELLEN SEGAL HUVELLE  
United States District Judge

DATE: August 3, 2010

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

<hr/>		)	
NORTHWEST AUSTIN MUNICIPAL		)	
UTILITY DISTRICT,		)	
		)	
Plaintiff,		)	
		)	
v.		)	Civil Action No. 06-1384 (DST, PLF, EGS)
		)	
ALBERTO GONZALES,		)	
Attorney General of the United States,		)	
		)	
Defendants.		)	
<hr/>		)	

ORDER

Before the Court are the motions to intervene of the Texas State Conference of NAACP Branches, *et al.*, Rodney Louis, *et al.*, and David Diaz, *et al.* Upon consideration of the motions, oppositions, replies, and the record of the entire case, it is hereby

ORDERED that the motion of the Texas State Conference of NAACP Branches, *et al.*, to intervene [9] is GRANTED; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the answer of defendant-intervenors Texas State Conference of NAACP Branches, *et al.*, shall be deemed filed as of the date of this Order; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion of Rodney Louis, *et al.*, to intervene [10] is GRANTED; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the answer of defendant-intervenors Rodney Louis, *et al.*, shall be deemed filed as of the date of this Order; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to amend or correct [22] the motion of David Diaz, *et al.*, to intervene is GRANTED, and Gabriel Diaz is therefore added as a proposed defendant-intervenor; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion of David Diaz, *et al.*, to intervene [13] is GRANTED; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the answer of defendant-intervenors, David Diaz, *et al.*, shall be deemed filed as of the date of this Order; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the plaintiff, defendant, and defendant-intervenors, in compliance with Local Civil Rule 16.3 of this Court and Rule 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, shall meet and confer and submit to this Court a joint report on or before November 28, 2006. The parties shall particularly address the issue of what dispositive motions, if any, they intend to file and what briefing schedule they propose.

SO ORDERED.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
DAVID S. TATEL  
United States Circuit Judge

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
PAUL L. FRIEDMAN  
United States District Judge

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
EMMET G. SULLIVAN  
United States District Judge

DATE: November 9, 2006



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____	)	
NORTHWEST AUSTIN MUNICIPAL	)	
UTILITY DISTRICT,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 06-1384 (DST, PLF, EGS)
	)	
ALBERTO GONZALES,	)	
Attorney General of the United States, <u>et al.</u> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

ORDER

Before the Court are the motions to intervene of People for the American Way, Nathaniel Lesane, and Travis County, Texas. Upon consideration of the motions, oppositions, replies, and the record of the entire case, it is hereby

ORDERED that the motion of the People for the American Way to intervene [19] is GRANTED; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the answer of defendant-intervenor People for the American Way shall be deemed filed as of the date of this Order; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion of Nathaniel Lesane to intervene [28] is GRANTED; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the answer of defendant-intervenor Nathaniel Lesane shall be deemed filed as of the date of this Order; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion of Travis County, Texas to intervene [23] is GRANTED; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the answer of defendant-intervenor Travis County, Texas shall be deemed filed as of the date of this Order; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff, defendants, and defendant-intervenors People for the American Way, Nathaniel Lesane, and Travis County, Texas, in compliance with this Court's November 9, 2006 Order and pursuant to Local Civil Rule 16.3 of this Court and Rule 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, shall meet and confer and submit to this Court a joint report on or before November 28, 2006. The parties shall particularly address the issue of what dispositive motions, if any, they intend to file and what briefing schedule they propose.

SO ORDERED.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
DAVID S. TATEL  
United States Circuit Judge

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
PAUL L. FRIEDMAN  
United States District Judge

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
EMMET G. SULLIVAN  
United States District Judge

DATE: November 15, 2006

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____	)	
NORTHWEST AUSTIN MUNICIPAL	)	
UTILITY DISTRICT,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 06-1384 (DST, PLF, EGS)
	)	
ALBERTO GONZALES,	)	
Attorney General of the United States, <u>et al.</u> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

ORDER

Before the Court are the motions to intervene of Angie Garcia, *et al.* Upon consideration of the motions, oppositions, and the record of the entire case, it is hereby

ORDERED that the motion of Angie Garcia, *et al.*, to intervene [32] is GRANTED; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the answer of defendant-intervenor Angie Garcia, *et al.*, shall be deemed filed as of the date of this Order; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that defendant-intervenors Angie Garcia, *et al.*, in compliance with this Court's November 9, 2006 and November 15, 2006 Orders and pursuant to Local Civil Rule 16.3 of this Court and Rule 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, shall meet and confer with plaintiff, defendants, and defendant-intervenors already parties in this case, and submit to this Court a joint report on or before November 28, 2006. The parties shall particularly address the issue of what dispositive motions, if any, they intend to file and what briefing schedule they propose; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that defendant-intervenors Angie Garcia, *et al.*, as well as all other defendants and defendant-intervenors already parties in this case, and in compliance with this Court's November 15, 2006 Order, shall submit a report on or before November 28, 2006 discussing what steps will be taken to avoid duplication of effort by defendants, to reduce redundant filings and discovery requests, and to promote efficiency in the litigation of this matter. Specifically, the defendant and intervenor-defendants will address coordination of their efforts through a lead counsel.

SO ORDERED.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
DAVID S. TATEL  
United States Circuit Judge

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
PAUL L. FRIEDMAN  
United States District Judge

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
EMMET G. SULLIVAN  
United States District Judge

DATE: November 17, 2006

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____	)	
NORTHWEST AUSTIN MUNICIPAL	)	
UTILITY DISTRICT,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 06-1384 (DST, PLF, EGS)
	)	
ALBERTO GONZALES,	)	
Attorney General of the United States, <u>et al.</u> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

ORDER

Before the Court is the motion to intervene of Winthrop Graham, *et al.* Upon consideration of the motion, opposition, reply, and the record of the entire case, it is hereby

ORDERED that the motion of Winthrop Graham, *et al.*, to intervene [70] is GRANTED; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the plaintiff may move for a reasonable extension of time to complete any necessary discovery related to the Graham defendant-intervenors.

SO ORDERED.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
DAVID S. TATEL  
United States Circuit Judge

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
PAUL L. FRIEDMAN  
United States District Judge

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
EMMET G. SULLIVAN  
United States District Judge

DATE: